1	
	1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : 18-CR-408 (BMC)
4	Plaintiff, : United States Counthouse
5	: United States Courthouse -against- : Brooklyn, New York :
6	WEI MEI GAO, : also known as "Vivian" :
7	and "Weimei," : : Thursday, November 5, 2020
8	Defendant. : 12:30 p.m.
9	
10	
11	TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR SENTENCING
12	BEFORE THE HONORABLE BRIAN M. COGAN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13	ONITED STATES DISTRICT SUDGE
14	APPEARANCES:
15	For the Government: SETH D. DuCHARME, ESQ. Acting United States Attorney
16	Eastern District of New York 271 Cadman Plaza East
17	Brooklyn, New York 11201 BY: WILLIAM CAMPOS, ESQ.
18	Assistant United States Attorney
19	For the Defendant: STACEY A. VAN MALDEN, ESQ.
20	5114 Post Road Bronx, New York 10471
21	
22	Court Reporter: DAVID R. ROY, RPR 225 Cadman Plaza East
23	Brooklyn, New York 11201 drroyofcr@gmail.com
24	Proceedings recorded by Stenographic machine shorthand,
25	transcript produced by Computer-Assisted Transcription.

	Proceedings	2
1	(In open court.)	
2	(The interpreter previously sworn.)	
3	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: The United States versus	
4	Wei Gao, Docket Number 18-CR-408.	
5	Counsel, please state your appearances, starting	
6	with the Government.	
7	MR. CAMPOS: William Campos for the United States.	
8	Good afternoon, Your Honor.	
9	THE COURT: Good afternoon.	
10	MS. MALKO: And Michelle Malko from Probation.	
11	Good afternoon.	
12	THE COURT: Good afternoon.	
13	MS. VAN MALDEN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. On	
14	behalf of Ms. Gao, Stacey Van Malden.	
15	THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon.	
16	Good afternoon, Ms. Gao.	
17	DEFENDANT GAO: Good afternoon.	
18	THE INTERPRETER: Also present is Stephanie Liu,	
19	Chinese interpreter.	
20	THE COURT: All right. We also have a Chinese	
21	interpreter doing Chinese simultaneous translation who has	
22	been previously sworn.	
23	Okay. We are on for sentencing of both Ms. Gao,	
24	and then we will following that up with her husband,	
25	Mr. Xia.	

3 Proceedings 1 Do you want to proceed with Ms. Gao first? It 2 doesn't matter to me. 3 MR. CAMPOS: It's up to the Court. I have no 4 preference. 5 THE COURT: All right. I assume Defense Counsel has talked and that is the way you want to do it? 6 7 MS. VAN MALDEN: Sure. 8 MR. CAMPOS: Sure. 9 MS. VAN MALDEN: It doesn't matter. 10 THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. 11 All right. Let me start by reviewing the 12 documents that I have read in preparing for this sentencing 13 proceeding. 14 Ms. Gao, if any of the documents I recite are not familiar to you, if you have not gone over them with your 15 16 attorney let me know, and we will take a break so that you 17 can do that. 18 All right. I start with the presentence 19 investigation report of April 6th of this year. There is 20 one addendum to that report dated September 22nd -- I'm 21 sorry, there are two addenda. The second one is dated 22 October 20th, 2020. 23 I then have a sentencing memorandum from 24 Ms. Van Malden dated October 15th with letters attached to 25 it in Chinese and translated into English.

Proceedings 4 I have the Government's sentencing memorandum of 1 2 October 23rd. 3 Now, I also have two other things: I have a 4 memorandum from Probation talking about the child-care issue with regard to the couple, the defendant couple. And then I 5 believe I have shown Ms. Gao and her attorney the revised 6 7 probation sentencing recommendation in which Probation is 8 recommending one year and one day custody plus other terms, 9 of course. That is what I have read in preparing for this 10 sentencing. 11 Is there anything else that I should be looking 12 at? 13 MS. VAN MALDEN: No, Your Honor. 14 MR. CAMPOS: Not from the Government. 15 Okay. Ms. Gao, are you familiar with THE COURT: those documents, and have you discussed them with your 16 17 lawyer? 18 **DEFENDANT GAO:** Yes. 19 THE COURT: All right. With regard to the facts 20 that will control sentencing with one exception that we will 21 be talking about in a little bit, I think there is no 22 dispute about the description of the offense or the defender characteristics as set forth in the PSR and the addenda; is 23 24 that correct? 25 MS. VAN MALDEN: That's correct, Your Honor.

MR. CAMPOS: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. We are going to talk about whether the goods were imported for guideline purposes. It does not matter to me for non-guideline purposes. So I will adopt those portions of Sections A and C of the PSR that describe the offense and the offender characteristics as my findings of fact for purposes of this sentencing.

Now, with regard to the guidelines, which are, of course, advisory and only one issue for me to consider in determining the appropriate sentence, we have one adjustment that is an issue. Probation has proposed that there should be two points added because these goods were imported. I think, Ms. Van Malden, your point is that she did not do the importation --

And Can you remind me, Mr. Campos, where have I come out on this in the other sentences, because I know you are not putting the implication enhancement in?

MR. CAMPOS: For the defendants in the prior cases that we had not put -- that have gone to sentencing that have not had -- the Government did not advocate for two points. The Court questioned the Government on that and the Court accepted the Government's statements that for those particular defendants in the past, it was the Government's position that there was insufficient proof that the defendant -- that the Government could prove that those

Davic K. Roy, RPK, CSK, CCR Official Court Reporter

6 Proceedings 1 goods had been imported --2 THE COURT: Okav. MR. CAMPOS: -- and that the defendants knew that 3 4 those goods had been imported. 5 THE COURT: All right. I mean, this one seems that these defendants were one more step removed from 6 7 importation than the wholesale defendants or the container 8 defendants, right? 9 MR. CAMPOS: Indeed, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Okay. For that reason, I am going to go along with the parties' guideline estimate as set forth 11 12 in their plea agreement, and that is --13 And I am not finding it quickly. Help me out, 14 Mr. Campos. 15 MR. CAMPOS: Oh, Your Honor, the guidelines that 16 the Government had estimated and that the Court is going to 17 rule upon was an offense level of 22 minus the three levels 18 for acceptance of responsibility for a Level 19, with a Criminal History Category 1, with a range of imprisonment of 19 30 to 37 months. 20 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 I adopt that as my finding, unless, All right. 23 Ms. Van Malden, you have anything else you want to say about 24 it? 25 No, Your Honor. MS. VAN MALDEN:

7 Proceedings 1 THE COURT: Okay. That is my finding on the 2 guideline range. Let me, then, hear from parties as to the 3 4 application of all of the 3553(a) factors. 5 I will start with you, Ms. Van Malden. MS. VAN MALDEN: Your Honor, I set forth most of 6 7 my arguments in my letter and I know that you've read it, 8 and so I don't want to reiterate what you have already read. 9 This is a case in which Ms. Gao mailed to -- she 10 had a shipping business and she was given boxes and she knew 11 there were counterfeit goods inside. She didn't have 12 control over the amount or the value of those goods. 13 was essentially a middle person. She took the goods from 14 them. She shipped them. Some of these goods went COD, just like UPS does COD, FedEx does COD, and the U.S. Postal 15 16 Service does COD. So that's not so beyond crazy that she 17 would do COD packaging for the shipper. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Then what did she do with the COD? 19 20 MS. VAN MALDEN: With the --21 THE COURT: COD, cash on delivery --22 MS. VAL MALDEN: 0h --23 THE COURT: -- what did she do with the cash? 24 MS. VAN MALDEN: She gave it back to the shipper. 25 That's what the allegations by the Government are, she

didn't keep that money.

What the Government refers to as "unabashed greed," Your Honor, was that Ms. Gao and her husband, Mr. Xia, over a four-year period made \$90,000 from the shipping of these goods. Now, if you break that down each year, that means each year they made a whopping \$22,500. And if you split that again between the two of them, right, each of them made about \$11,000. So their unabashed greed resulted in them earning approximately one/third of the minimum wage in New York State.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, do you have any idea what the gross revenues were for the legitimate part of the business?

MS. VAN MALDEN: There was not a lot, which is why she -- this is one of the reasons why she ended up shipping these types of goods. She didn't do very well in the business. She opened it with all the best of intentions. She was not doing well. She was not bringing money home. Ultimately, she closed it, not because of this case, but I think they closed it before the case began or right around the same time as the case began because they weren't making any money. And it wasn't the type of closing -- it was a corporation. They actually had their accountant put the right paperwork in. This was a legitimate business. Unfortunately, a large portion of the business involved

these counterfeit goods.

Now, the Government may also point out that there was a one-off where they may have sold some belts or some -- I think it was belts that were counterfeit. That was kind of a one-off, but they didn't make a ton of money from that. So essentially what you have is literally a mom-and-pop shop that was shipping goods.

Did they import? No. Did they have anything to do with the containers? No. Did they have anything to do with the fraudulent paperwork for the people at the ports? No. They had done small bits, as kind of the people that shipped. They didn't earn money on either end. What they got was money for their shipping. There's been no evidence that they charged any more or received any more from these packages versus other packages. So unabashed greed is really not the reason for this crime. This was people trying to have a business and then getting this opportunity, granted not a legal opportunity, to, I guess, earn some money, put some food on the table for their kids.

So they knew that the items were counterfeit.

They knew that it wasn't legal to have counterfeit goods, had no idea they were looking at ten years in jail for it, at least not that type of thing. That's not the kind of people these people are.

THE COURT: You know, I am going to ask Mr. Xia's

Proceedings

lawyer about this as well, but it does seem to me that they were living higher than the way you are describing it. You know, they seemed to have a nice house in Syosset, and the lifestyle that is not -- you know, it's not superluxurious, but it's also not hand-to-mouth.

MS. VAN MALDEN: Well, it's a lifestyle, which -there's more than just their immediate family with them.

And they also receive -- they were living with Mr. Xia's
parents, so it was a community. It's more of a community
effort. And they also had some -- their credit card
expenses. So this is not like -- it's not like they were
just -- it's a community effort; and when you put everything
together, you can live a little better than you can on your
own. So that's how I would address that particular concern
for the Court.

The other thing that brings Ms. Gao specifically out of the heartland cases is her health issues, and I've been here at least once before asking if Ms. Gao can go to China to get treatment for her thyroid cancer. And she was able to get the treatment that she needed here, but after the PSR was written, she had to go back for another surgery right now, and she's had two of these iodine 131 treatments. So in January, she needs to go back to see if they're working. And I put a paragraph in here about that cancer treatments in our prison system is not very good. And I

Davic K. Roy, RPK, CSK, CCR Officia: Court Reporter

11 Proceedings know, Your Honor, might say, Well okay, she'll go in after. 1 2 But it's an ongoing thing. And then they do have two 3 children. They need to be cared for. 4 Mrs. Xia, Mr. Xia's mother, who recently came out of the hospital, the reason she's here today is they didn't 5 6 have anybody to keep an eye on her while they were here 7 today. 8 THE COURT: What happened to the community? 9 MS. VAN MALDEN: The community over time has just 10 dissipated, and the COVID has made people stay away. For example, their sister, Mr. Xia's sister who owns 11 12 99 Cent Store, is in contact with the public every day. 13 Ms. Gao and her mother-in-law, they're high-risk people. 14 You don't want a person who is going out in the world every day coming home and spreading COVID-19. 15 16 THE COURT: Well, I think Probation had some concerns, or at least I inferred there were such concerns, 17 18 about the fact that Ms. Gao is a home attendant for a 19 relative and getting paid, but I do not know how she is 20 getting paid? 21 MS. VAN MALDEN: I can tell you I have some 22 experience with that personally, if you're interested. 23 THE COURT: Yes. 24 MS. VAL MALDEN: What New York State is doing with 25 Medicaid patients that are being treated at home, because

Proceedings

New York believes that it's better to keep people at home -it's cheaper and safer to keep them at home than put them in
a facility. So what they do is they have set this up
formally, members are permitted to be the home-health-care
attendant and to be paid the fee, whatever it is, \$8, or
minimum wage, \$15 an hour, that they would be paying to an
outside nurse. And it's a program -- it's a legitimate
program in New York State. And if I wasn't busy being a
lawyer, I probably would have done that for my mom before
she passed. But, I mean, it is definitely something that my
brother and I looked into, and I know it is a legitimate
thing. So that is a thing that New York State has started,

So if Probation wants to a look, it's under City of New York State under Medicaid and health care and home-health care, and that's -- it's a thing. It really is. So that's not crazy. That does happen.

But she has these health issues. She's a great mom. She's taking care of her mother-in-law. And when we look at -- and I know I gave you a bunch of cases. Now, some of those will be -- were pre-advisory guidelines, I think.

THE COURT: Okay.

and it's actually quite popular.

MS. VAN MALDEN: And that's --

THE COURT: No, I understand. But really, I could

Davic K. Roy, RPK, CSK, CCR Officia: Court Reporter

come up with a list of cases that are different than your list and suggest something very different, right?

MS. VAN MALDEN: Of course.

THE COURT: The individual cases in terms of disparity elimination are not all that helpful, I generally find.

MS. VAN MALDEN: Well, what we've looked to are the sentences that you have already given out in this case --

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. VAN MALDEN: -- and in this case, there were two -- there was a probation and a time served. And I would say that compared to even the two individuals who received probation who were on the importation end, on the container end, that their act in this very big conspiracy were less than that, and as a result, they would deserve similar sentencing because they were not involved in the importation and they were not involved in the containers and they didn't go to China to order the goods. They simply took the goods, put them in a -- they didn't even put them in the box. They came in a box and they sent them to be shipped.

THE COURT: But on the other hand, the amount of money involved for these two defendants is higher than it was for any of the others. And the others were -- I mean, I think one of them had 400,000, one of them had 150, one of

Davic K. Roy, RPK, CSK, CCR Official Court Reporter

14 Proceedings I have got 550 for each of these two 1 them had 250. 2 defendants, plus I have got higher gains by these two 3 defendants, net amount gains. You know, it's 90,000 as 4 compared to the ones I gave probation and time served to, which were about half of that, or less than half of that, 5 6 SO... 7 Well, I tend to agree with you, it's about the There may be some more culpable conduct on the two 8 same. 9 that I have sentenced to probation and time served. But I 10 think it comes out in a wash, pretty much. MS. VAN MALDEN: We can't argue with you on that, 11 12 Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Yes. 14 MS. VAL MALDEN: The only thing that I can point out about the higher amounts is that they didn't really have 15 16 any control over the value of what was shipped. 17 THE COURT: Yeah. I mean, it's kind of like a 18 courier case that way, right? You know, they didn't really 19 care what was in the trailer because they were getting paid 20 But it is a relevant factor in determining the regardless. 21 amount of damage to the victims that stood to be done, 22 right? 23 MS. VAN MALDEN: Certainly. And you can -- they 24 can pay restitution to their victims, which there is a

restitution order, I'm sure, that will be part of their

15 Proceedings 1 sentence. So I would suggest that that would be a more 2 appropriate way to address that particular issue. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 MS. VAN MALDEN: So, Your Honor, I'm not going to take up too much more of your time. I think that we've 5 6 covered everything. 7 So unless you have any further concerns or questions, I'm just going to ask for probation. Thank you, 8 9 Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Van Malden. 11 Ms. Gao, is there anything that you would like to 12 I have read your letter, of course, but I am happy to 13 hear from you further if you would like me to. 14 DEFENDANT GAO: I want to apologize to Your Honor about this case, because right now my children are still 15 16 very young, and also my mother-in-law is facing serious 17 health issues. I hope that you grant me an opportunity so 18 that I could still take care of them, and then also I would 19 be able to be in a position to take good care of my children 20 as well. 21 I know that I'm wrong about what I've done. And 22 also I want my children never to commit the same crime of 23 going through the same path as I did right now. 24 Thank you, Ms. Gao. THE COURT: Okay.

Thank you.

DEFENDANT GAO:

THE COURT: All right. I'll hear from the Government.

MR. CAMPOS: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, the Government has put its reasons for in the letter. I would just note that while this defendant, obviously, did not smuggle the goods into the country, but the defendant is also not just a street-level seller. Instead, she and her husband had a business model for shipping almost exclusively counterfeit goods throughout the country. That was their model. The goods were not isolated here in New York. You know, they became like the FedEx for counterfeit-good shippers. And I think that is a unique category of individuals that are in an important link in this -- you know, the whole chain of distribution. So consequently without them, there would need to be somebody else.

And why them? They knew what they were shipping. They didn't stop that. They did a couple of interesting things with the money orders and all of that, but it -- to hide the identity of the people shipping. So to say that they were kind of like a street seller, that's not quite right. I mean, we're not suggesting that they were importers, but they were an important cog.

And the other thing I would just note, Your Honor.

I think Counsel talked about the amount of money. This

	Proceedings 17
1	defendant and her husband who ran the business, each agreed
2	to a \$90,000 forfeiture amount. So in terms of the money, I
3	think that may be slightly off. But, Your Honor, the
4	Government
5	THE COURT: They each got 90,000 out of this or
6	because they are jointly liable for the 90,000, that they as
7	a couple got out of it?
8	MR. CAMPOS: No, because we estimated that they
9	each got 90,000.
10	THE COURT: Okay. Anything further?
11	MR. CAMPOS: No, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	All right. I just want to ask Probation a couple
14	of questions. The admission on the sentencing
15	recommendation and the memo that I got in the Xia case
16	helped me deal with this case from Probation was helpful.
17	But I am wondering if you could give me any more
18	insight as to any concerns Probation has about
19	the undisclosed support mechanisms for this family, whether
20	financial or personal?
21	MS. MALKO: Well, in this case
22	THE COURT: You can sit down. That's fine.
23	MS. MALKO: I'm sorry.
24	I guess specifically to do with more of the
25	restitution order and making sure that that's put out

Proceedings

appropriately, and I think the appropriate 10 percent -once restitution is starting to get out, that it is paid at
the appropriate 10 percent monthly, we would need a personal
financial statement. We did received one from Ms. Gao, but
we did not receive one from her spouse.

But that was the only concern, unless Your Honor has --

THE COURT: Well, you know, you are suggesting, I think, that there are sufficient resources here so that for at least a short incarceratory sentence, the children and mother would be taken care of as long as I do not put husband and wife into custody at the same time; is that a fair conclusion from what I'm reading?

MS. MALKO: Essentially, yes, because they are both working. Because the husband works for his business, his family business, and he would likely not be losing that job once he is, you know, released after having been incarcerated. And the wife is essentially working with her mother-in-law, you know, taking care of her at the house. I think that that would be it.

But we did say that it is difficult with all the finances that we have received to make a determination if they would be able to be cared for in terms of either to pay for any kind of extra child care, such a live-in nanny or a babysitter. It's obviously difficult for us to make a

Davic K. Roy, RPK, CSK, CCR Official Court Reporter

decision based on the finances that we have received thus far.

THE COURT: Okay.

All right. Ms. Van Malden, if you want to say anything to that, I will give you a chance.

MS. VAN MALDEN: I think I have covered everything, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I have considered all the factors under 18 U.S.C., Section 3553(a), including the advisory guidelines. A guideline sentence here I think is not necessary to accomplish the goals of sentencing, but I do think a short incarceratory sentence is appropriate.

I am troubled by someone in this position getting as much as \$90,000 for shipping these -- carrying these counterfeit goods. And I don't think that that is something where I can just say no custody is appropriate. I am not all that worried about Ms. Gao repeating the conduct. I think she is likely not to repeat it. But I do think, you know, and I have said this in the other cases as well -- some of the other cases, a message needs to be sent out that, you know, this kind of almost epidemic criminal activity, very pervasive criminal activity just cannot be done because there are too many companies who have workers who get injured by doing this kind of thing. So I think the crime, you know, it's a federal crime for a reason. This

could be punished civilly only if that is what Congress wanted to do, but it did not. So I do not think a guideline sentence is necessary. I do think that some custody is appropriate.

I am, therefore, going to impose a sentence of six months' custody; restitution in the amount of \$275,000 jointly and severally with the co-defendants. That is due immediately, but payable at a rate of \$25 per quarter while in custody and at a rate of 10 percent gross monthly income while on supervised release. She has also got to comply with the order of forfeiture that I have signed.

I am also going to impose one year of supervised release which has compliance with forfeiture and restitution; also full financial disclosure, including comingled income, expenses, assets and liabilities, and tax returns. Other than the accounts that are set forth in the presentence report, she is prohibited from opening or maintaining any other accounts without approval of Probation. She has got to fully cooperate with the probation officer in investigating any financial dealings she has, including upon request providing truthful monthly statements of her income and expenses. She has also got to sign any necessary documents to make that easier for Probation.

Now, I also understand that she is a green

cardholder. In the event that she is removed from the country, she may not enter illegally. She may not re-enter illegally, and she has to comply with all of the instructions of the immigration authorities.

I am not going to impose a fine, because I do not think she would be able to afford it considering her restitution obligation. I will impose the mandatory \$100 special assessment.

Now, in terms of surrender date, what I would like to do is this, and I am open to suggestions, Ms. Van Malden: Particularly because of her medical treatment, I would like to delay her surrender date to a date 60 days after her husband is released from custody if I sentence him to custody, or 60 days after today if I don't sentence him to custody. That leaves us with an open-surrender date, because I have not sentenced her husband yet. If you consent, what I will do is simply say I will enter a surrender date in the judgment that says what I have just said, you know, 60 days after the husband is no longer in custody.

If you do not consent, then stand by. I will sentence the husband. I will re-call this case, and then I will, again, impose that same condition but with a definite date at that point. So I don't really see a reason to reconvene this for that purpose, but it is your choice as to

Davic K. Roy, RPK, CSK, CCR Official Court Reporter

	Proceedings 22
1	what you want to do.
2	MS. VAN MALDEN: The only thing that I would ask
3	is if it's 60 days from today, then if you could make it 90
4	days or make it an even larger surrender date because of her
5	treatment in January?
6	THE COURT: Yes, that is fine.
7	I should also say in terms of her treatment, I am
8	elastic on the surrender date. You know, you can come to me
9	in March, I will give you until March. That's fine. And if
10	she is still getting treatment, I might delay it further.
11	Okay? Because I do want her to have her treatment. I think
12	that is important. I don't want her to start her custody
13	until she gets that. Depending what happens with her
14	husband, that may not be a factor. Okay? It may be all
15	done, depending on what I do with him.
16	But certainly I will set a March 1st well,
17	let's say I set well, I don't want to set March 1st
18	because if I sentence him to more time, I have them in at
19	the same time.
20	MS. VAL MALDEN: Yes.
21	THE COURT: So unless you want me to reconvene, I
22	will just tell you it will be no earlier than the end of
23	March.
24	MS. VAL MALDEN: Okay.
25	THE COURT: Okay?

	Proceedings	23
1	MS. VAL MALDEN: All right. Thank you,	
2	Your Honor.	
3	THE COURT: And as late as 60 days after her	
4	husband is released into custody, you know, whichever is	
5	longer.	
6	MS. VAN MALDEN: That sounds good.	
7	THE COURT: Okay.	
8	MS. VAL MALDEN: All right, Your Honor. That's	
9	great.	
10	THE COURT: Well, that is as great as possible	
11	when somebody is being sentenced	
12	MS. VAL MALDEN: Oh, right.	
13	THE COURT: to federal prison.	
14	MS. VAN MALDEN: Yes, Your Honor, that is what I	
15	meant to say.	
16	THE COURT: All right. And then we have open	
17	counts, Mr. Campos?	
18	MR. CAMPOS: We do, Your Honor.	
19	THE COURT: Okay.	
20	MR. CAMPOS: And the Government moves to dismiss	
21	those open counts.	
22	THE COURT: Those and the underlying indictment	
23	are dismissed.	
24	All right. So, Ms. Van Malden, is there anything	J
25	further before I advise Ms. Gao of her appellate rights at	

Proceedings 24 this time? 1 2 MS. VAN MALDEN: No, not from the defendant, Your Honor. 3 4 THE COURT: Thank you. Is there anything further, Mr. Campos, before I 5 advise her of her appellate rights? 6 No, Your Honor, not from the 7 MR. CAMPOS: 8 Government. 9 THE COURT: Thank you. 10 All right. Ms. Gao, by virtue of your plea 11 agreement, you have waived your right to appeal your 12 conviction and sentence. However, if you think there was 13 something fundamentally wrong with either your conviction or 14 your sentence, you can attempt to appeal by filing what is 15 called a Notice of Appeal within 14 days. Ms. Van Malden 16 will do that for you if you ask her to. If you certify to 17 the Clerk of the Court that you cannot afford a lawyer, the 18 Clerk will do it for you. Or you can get the one-page form 19 yourself and do it. But it remains your responsibility no 20 matter how you delegate it to make sure that that notice is 21 filed within 14 days to get the appeal process going. 22 Otherwise, you will have permanently waived any right to 23 appeal that you might have. 24 And did I impose the special All right. 25 assessment earlier?

	Proceedings 25
1	MR. CAMPOS: You did, Your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
3	Is there anything further, Ms. Van Malden? It
4	looks like she may have a question.
5	Do you want to check with her?
6	MS. VAL MALDEN: Sure.
7	THE COURT: Go ahead.
8	MS. VAL MALDEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
9	(Pause in proceedings.)
10	MS. VAL MALDEN: (Indicating.)
11	THE COURT: Do you have anything further,
12	Ms. Van Malden?
13	MS. VAN MALDEN: We have nothing further,
14	Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: All right.
16	MS. VAL MALDEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	MR. CAMPOS: Thank you, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Thank you very much.
20	We are adjourned.
21	(Matter concluded.)
22	00000
23	I (we) certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
24	from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
25	<u>/s/ David R. Roy</u> January 7, 2021 DAVID R. ROY Date